

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF MAINE

JEFFERY DANIEL NASON.

Plaintiff,

 \mathbf{V}_i

NICHOLS.

Defendants

Civil No. 06-173-P-H

RECOMMENDED DECISION OF CIVIL COMPLAINT

On October 18, 2006, Jeffery Nason filed a complaint and a motion to proceed in forma pauperis. I granted the latter in a October 18, 2006, order and directed that Nason was to amend his complaint by no later than November 1, 2006, setting forth the jurisdictional basis for his federal complaint. I cautioned that failure to comply with this order could result in summary dismissal. Nason has not filed an amended complaint.

This leaves the court with Nason's initial complaint allegations which are as follows.

In June I filled out an application at Nichols. Awhile later I received a rejection letter. I returned a few months later, the sign was still out front. "Now Hiring." I went in to inquire further. The lady at the human resource department gave me another rejection letter. I would like to call compliance.

I would like to open a case (or determine if I have one or not) on this matter. The now Hiring sign had been out for about three months, and I can't see why I wasn't hired.

The relief I am seeking in this manner is financial. They would probably fire me shortly after if given a position by the court.

(Compl. at 1.)

I can identify no federal jurisdictional link in Nason's allegations. I recommend that the Court dismiss the complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).¹

NOTICE

A party may file objections to those specified portions of a magistrate judge's report or proposed findings or recommended decisions entered pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) for which *de novo* review by the district court is sought, together with a supporting memorandum, within ten (10) days of being served with a copy thereof. A responsive memorandum shall be filed within ten (10) days after the filing of the objection.

Failure to file a timely objection shall constitute a waiver of the right to *de novo* review by the district court and to appeal the district court's order.

/s/ Margaret J. Kravchuk
U.S. Magistrate Judge

November 3, 2006.

¹ Because this is a recommended decision Nason has an opportunity to respond to this sua sponte disposition before it becomes final. See Griffiths v. Amtrak, No. 03-1591, 2004 WL 1754043, *1 (1st Cir. Aug. 6, 2004) (not selected for publication)